

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated June 18, 2007. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested.

Support for the present amendment is found throughout the Specification as originally filed. For example, support for the present amendments is found in lines 5-25 on page 9 of the Specification. No new matter has been added.

At paragraphs 1-31 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 6-15, and 17-57 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, citing United States Patent number 6,097,720 of Araujo et al. ("Araujo et al.") in combination with United States Patent number 6,415,323 of McCanne et al. ("McCanne et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As previously noted, the Araujo et al. system enables multicast distribution efficiencies in a dialup access environment, and includes a multicast source end station, such as a remote access server for an Internet service provider, and a plurality of multicast receiving end stations, such as customer premises equipment CPE, coupled to an intermediate device in the network. In multiple sections, Araujo et al. expressly and repeatedly teach establishing connections (e.g. point-to-point sessions or "PPP") both between a source end station and the plurality of receiving end stations and between the multicast source end station and the intermediate device, through which the source end station feeds multicast messages to the intermediate device. See for example Abstract, lines 8-15, column 2, lines 34-42, column 3 lines 27-30, column 6 lines 35-37, and column 6 lines 58-65.

McCanne et al. discloses a proximity-oriented redirection system for service-to-client attachment in a virtual overlay distribution network. McCanne et al. teaches that clients attach to the content distribution network at per client service access points, as well as user-specific authentication.

Nowhere in the combination of Araujo et al. and McCanne et al. is there disclosed or suggested any multicast communication system having multiple subscriber locations, each subscriber location having a single access device through which a plurality of subscriber devices access multicast information sent by a multicast distribution device, including:

*. . . wherein said **multicast distribution device does not authenticate said subscriber devices at said subscriber location for said access device prior to said access device distributing to each of said subscriber devices at said subscriber location for said access device multicast information sent to said access device by said multicast distribution device over multicast routes established to said access device from said multicast distribution device in response to said multicast distribution device successfully authenticating said access device and said access device having joined said multicast group as a result of said successful authentication.*** (emphasis added)

as in the present independent claims 1, 4, 15, 28 and 42. The above highlighted authentication features set forth a selective approach to authentication completely absent from the combination of Araujo et al. and McCanne et al. The Examiner has recognized that Araujo et al. does not include any teaching with regard to authentication, and now relies on McCanne et al. in this regard. McCanne et al. expressly discloses a system in which *each* client attaches to the network through a per-client service access point, and in which *user-specific* authentication is performed. See lines 5-13 in column 6 of McCanne et al. While this aspect of McCanne et al. is consistent with the teachings of Araujo et al. regarding PPP connections established between a source and *each* receiving end station, it stands in clear contradistinction to the above features of the present

independent claims, which set forth that *no authentication is performed with regard to subscriber devices* prior to the access device distributing multicast information to each access device at its subscriber location *sent to said access device by said multicast distribution device over multicast routes established to said access device from said multicast distribution device in response to said multicast distribution device successfully authenticating said access device and said access device having joined said multicast group as a result of said successful authentication.* Instead, both Araujo et al. and McCanne et al. describe systems in which connections are established (Araujo et al.) and authentication performed (McCanne et al.) for each and every client/end station prior to distribution of information to such entities.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully urge that the combination of Araujo et al. and McCanne et al. does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims 1, 4, 15, 28 and 42. Accordingly, the combination of Araujo et al. and McCanne et al. does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to the present independent claims under 35 U.S.C. 103. As to the remaining claims, they each depend from either claim 1, 4, 15, 28 or 45, and are believed to be patentable over the combination of Araujo et al. and McCanne et al. for at least the same reasons. Reconsideration of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

For these reasons, the Examiner's rejections are respectfully believed to be overcome, and it is respectfully requested that they be withdrawn. This application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone David A. Dagg, Applicants' Attorney at 617-630-1131 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: November 8, 2007

/David Dagg/
David A. Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720

Docket No. 120-348